

year that we are in right now, \$167.2 billion will be given to corporations as tax breaks, \$167.2 billion. For each taxpayer out there listening tonight, that is \$1388 is going to support corporate tax breaks, and all these dreaded programs you heard about tonight, what is it going to cost us as a country, \$50 billion, \$1415 for each taxpayer, three times less.

But if this bill goes through and the cuts that we are going to talk about the next day or two, and we are going to turn around the savings and give it for another tax break for the rich, where does the money go? Why are we giving millions of dollars to McDonald's Corporation to sell chicken nuggets overseas as a tax break but yet we are going to cut \$7 billion over five years of the school nutrition program and all these students will be denied? Why do we give Campbell's Soup millions of dollars to sell soup overseas but yet we are going to cut our children \$7 billion over five years.

It is the politics of the rich and the poor all right. Today we had a chance to try to correct it with Mr. DEAL's bill, the Democratic bill on welfare reform.

Yes, we have to do some things differently. Mr. DEAL put forth a proposal that made a lot of sense and was defeated by party lines, 205 to 228, one Republican joined us.

What did the Democratic bill say? It was a welfare reform bill. That means requiring and assisting people to move out of the dependency of welfare and into self-sufficiency, work. Democrats believe in tough and fair work requirements, something their bill, which is right here, 1214, never had until yesterday.

At least they are learning from us. What else did the Democrat bill have? We believe that individuals need education and job training to become self-sufficient. You just do not cut them off and say, go get a job. Individuals need the opportunity to find work.

Welfare needs to be linked to work. That is what the Democratic proposal meant. That is what we believe in.

Unfortunately, it was defeated, strictly on party lines.

So as we do this debate tonight, remember, it is the politics of the rich and the poor. The poor are those who will be cut. Their cuts will go to pay for the tax breaks for the rich. AFDC, not Aid for Dependent Children, it is aid for dependent corporations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILBRAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MORE ON WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed listening tonight to many different viewpoints. I listened with great interest to my good friend from Illinois who could no longer stay with us on the floor.

Let me pause at this juncture to yield to my friend from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] who I think wants to read into the RECORD a couple of items of great import with reference to our friend from Michigan who preceded me in the well.

Mr. HOKE. I just want to point out that from the CRS report with respect to Michigan, there is a \$10,489,000 increase in the block grant program from 1996 over fiscal 1995. And in the state of Illinois, we have got a \$14 million increase. In the state of Texas we have a \$33 million increase. So as those flags go up, we see that in fact CRS has shown very clearly that there are increases.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

My friend from Illinois raised a valid point, and I think it is one we should all remember, that good people can agree to disagree, that good people can interpret in different manners the statistics available and the implications of various policy decisions, and, in fact, we can disagree on holy scripture.

I celebrate religious and spiritual diversity in this country. I thank my Creator that we live in a country where we are free to engage in the exercise of religion as we see fit.

□ 2215

But I would simply point out to my friend from Illinois, when he quoted Christ and the Gospel according to Matthew, Christ said when you do this to the least of these, you have done it also to me. He did not say when government does this for the least of these.

And then again there can be a legitimate difference of opinion about that. Perhaps some interpret the "you" to be a universal you, to be a government so powerful, so all encompassing that we would leave for government the responsibility to change the hearts of man, that we would leave for government the responsibility of charity and compassion, that it be the sole province of the Federal Government to provide the same according to its own definition. And that is a legitimate policy difference.

That is fine. Good people can disagree. But, Mr. Speaker, again, and I visited in a moment of almost levity with one of our distinguished colleagues on the other side today who looked at me with a wink and smile and asked me to calm down, and I nodded. But I will tell you, when people on the other side do as they did yesterday, comparing those of us in the new majority to members of the Third Reich or those of us involved in legitimate policy differences with a different

vision for America to slaveholders of the Civil War days, you wonder what is really at stake. Have we so perverted legitimate policy divisions and discussions that we are willing to engage in reckless name calling?

My friend from Michigan salutes the Deal bill. That is his right. I would simply point out, Mr. Speaker, to those assembled and to our audience gathered beyond this hall via television, that we have a different interpretation of who would have gone to work or who will go to work under our resolution as opposed to the work requirements in the Deal bill. Good people can disagree.

My friend from Minnesota came to talk about the personal nature of the so-called cuts, and I think that term is inaccurate, but he is entitled to that term because I believe he assumes that there is a vacuum into which his son is stepping and which there is no escape. But I know when I heard him speak of his son that his son has the wherewithal and the ability to take a detour in plans. It may not have been what he intended, but he will find another way to help. That his daughter-in-law, so intent on teaching children with learning disabilities, does not rely solely on the province of the Federal Government to do the same.

And I would invite my colleagues to come with me to the Sixth District of Arizona, to the small town of Holbrook, and visit a single mother who has battled the odds to open a restaurant and who time and again offers to the welfare-collecting youth of that city employment, and she tells me invariably after three weeks time the youngsters employed there leave. Why? Because it is simpler to take a check and a handout instead of a hand up.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The other side said that Michigan would actually gain money. That is only if the bill is not revised, and your CRS report, page 1, says that is subject to a base assumption you make as long as you do not revise it.

But you have revised it. Go to your bill, H.R. 1214. Go to page 122. And what do you do on the nutrition, the food block grants for these kids? You cut it 20 percent and put it in other programs. You have \$6.6 billion, take away 20 percent. It is \$1.3 billion.

You increase the administrative costs from 1.8 percent to 5 percent, add another \$334 million for administrative costs. The first year alone you cut \$1.6 billion from the nutrition program. Michigan gets nailed by \$1.5 million.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues tonight to talk about the Republican's mean-